



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/099,789	03/15/2002	A. Kent Sievers	1565.008US1	4880
21186 7590 02/15/2007 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER WANG, LIANG CHE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
2 MONTHS	02/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

MAILED

FEB 15 2007

Technology Center 2100

Application Number: 10/099,789
Filing Date: March 15, 2002
Appellant(s): SIEVERS ET AL.

Joseph P. Mehrle
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 11/20/2006 appealing from the Office action mailed 2/1/2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2003/0115280	QUINE et al.	6-2003
6,901,436	Schneider	5-2005

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. Claims 1-7, 26-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quine et al., US Publication Number 2003/1005280, hereinafter Quine, in views of Schneider, US Patent Number 6,901,436, hereinafter Schneider.
3. Referring to claim 1, Quine teaches a method for defining an electronic address (page 2 [0012], figure 7), comprising:
 - a. selecting a preferred domain name (page 2 [0012] lines 7-9);
 - b. selecting a preferred address format (page 8 [0079] lines 9-12);

Art Unit: 2155

- c. selecting one or more additional address formats in addition to the preferred address format (page 2 [0012] lines 3-5, page 8 [0079]);
- d. retaining the preferred domain name, the preferred address format, and the one or more additional address formats to define the electronic address (page 8 [0079] lines 12-13).

Quine does not teach selecting one or more additional domain names in addition to the preferred address format, and retaining the one or more additional domain names.

Schneider teaches additional selections of domain names are provided for registration (Col 16 lines 41-47.).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the additional domain names for user selections because both Quine and Schneider teaches inventions relating to defining electronic addresses.

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Quine because having the multiple domain names available would allow potential registrant/entity to register a final selection from the valid domain names as taught by Schneider (Col 16 lines 41-47.)

- 4. Referring to claim 2, Quine as modified teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising acquiring a text string associated with a preferred electronic address and retaining the text string to further define the electronic address (figure 7 [0079] data formats are presented in a various orders of text strings.)
- 5. Referring to claim 3, Quine as modified teaches the method of claim 2, wherein in acquiring the text string, the text string is dynamically acquired from a directory object,

when present in the directory object (see figure 7, when a particular format is being selected, the real first name and last name are acquired dynamically to form the electronic address).

6. Referring to claim 4, Quine as modified teaches the method of claim 2, wherein in acquiring the text string, the preferred electronic address is calculated from a directory (figure 7, preferred electronic address is calculated from the directory of first and last name.)
7. Referring to claim 5, Quine as modified teaches the method of claim 1, wherein in selecting the preferred address format and the one or more additional address formats, the formats include one or more subcomponents (figure 7 [0079] format could be consisting first name and last name.)
8. Referring to claim 6, Quine as modified teaches the method of claim 1, wherein in selecting the preferred address format and the one or more additional address formats, the one or more subcomponents are order independent within the preferred address format and the one or more allowable address formats (figure 7, formats list 701, subcomponent LAST is independent to subcomponent FIRST.)
9. Referring to claim 7, Quine as modified teaches the method of claim 1, wherein in selecting the preferred address format and the one or more additional address formats, the preferred address format and the one or more additional address formats include one or more subcomponents, and wherein the one or more subcomponents include at least one of an electronic login name, an administrator defined identification, a first name, a last name, a middle initial, a middle name, and a nick name (see figure 7.)
10. Referring to claim 26, Quine teaches a method comprising:

Art Unit: 2155

- a. assigning a domain with an electronic mail (email) definition (page 2 [0012] lines 7-9, figure 7);
- b. assigning multiple prefix formats with the email definition (page 2 [0012] lines 7-9, figure 7);
- c. retaining the email definition, wherein any selected one of the multiple prefix formats when combined with any selected domain resolves to a same electronic address (page 8 [0079] lines 12-13).

Quine does not teach selecting one or more additional domain names in addition to the preferred address format, and retaining the one or more additional domain names.

Schneider teaches additional selections of domain names are provided for registration (Col 16 lines 41-47.).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the additional domain names for user selections because both Quine and Schneider teaches inventions relating to defining electronic addresses.

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Quine because having the multiple domain names available would allow potential registrant/entity to register a final selection from the valid domain names as taught by Schneider (Col 16 lines 41-47.)

11. Referring to claims 27-38, claims 27-39 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 1-7 and 26. Therefore, claim 27-38 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1-7, and 26.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellants argued in substance that:

- a. The proposed combination of Quine et al. (US Publication No. 2003/0115280) in views of Schneider (US 6,901,436), lacks a teaching or suggestion of multiple address formats or multiple prefix formats for an email. Specially, Quine does not permit multiple prefix formats (page 11).
- b. The proposed combination also lacks a teaching or suggestion of a “preferred domain” (page 11 line 8).
- c. The proposed combination would have had no motivation because to do so would have resulted in multiple valid addresses each having a prefix editor offered in Quine. That is, there is no mapping or retention of a definition that maps multiple valid domains and prefixes to a single email definition for a user.

In reply to argument (a), Quine does disclose in figure 7, page 8 paragraph [079], a list of multiple prefix formats for an email (the list under items 701 and 702 in figure 7 shows multiple sample addresses for user to select). Therefore appellant’s argument (a) is not persuasive to the Examiner, since Quine does teach multiple address formats or multiple prefix formats for an email as disclosed in figure 7.

In reply to argument (b), Quine disclosed a domain of “pg.com” (see figure 7), which is viewed as a “preferred domain name” and Schneider suggests in Col 16 lines 41-57, that when a valid domain name is available for the registration, the additional selection of available fictitious domain name may be concurrently displayed for an potential registrant to register a final selection from the valid or fictitious domain names. Therefore, Quine’s valid domain name “pg.com” is viewed as a “preferred domain name” in the proposed combination.

Art Unit: 2155


In reply to argument (c), Quine alone teaches mapping for a definition that maps multiple valid prefixes to a single email definition for a user (see figure 7, item 701, multiple formats are provided with different arrangement of prefixes, e.g. first.last), and Schneider suggests that multiple domains (Col 16 lines 41-57, "example.new", "example.sitemap", etc.) could also be displayed for potential registrant to register a final selection. Therefore, the argument (c) is not persuasive.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,


Liangche Alex Wang 


February 7, 2007

Conferees:

Lynne Browne

Saleh Najjar


Lynne H. Browne
Appeal Specialist, TQAS
Technology Center 2100


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER